



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ined, arbitration would have lost immeasurably in public confidence.

An examination of the text of the decision, which we give on another page, shows that Venezuela is given Point Barima with a strip of land about fifty miles long, thus securing to her entire control of the Orinoco river. The Orinoco, however, and the other rivers along which the boundary is drawn, are to be kept open to the merchant shipping of all nations. The valley of the Essequibo river and the whole coast up to the mouth of the Orinoco are awarded to Great Britain. This is a vast region rich in forests and probably in gold. But Great Britain loses all the territory, or practically so, claimed by her west of the original line drawn by Sir Robert Schomburgk in 1840. The boundary line drawn by the commission follows the original Schomburgk line almost entirely,—a line which had been vigorously rejected by both parties to the dispute.

The line of the boundary now fixed is about 175 miles east of England's extreme claim and 145 miles west of the extreme claim of Venezuela. Of the whole territory in dispute, about 200,000 square miles, each of the disputants gets a large area, the amount going to England being considerably in excess of that going to Venezuela. Venezuela, in addition to securing the entire control of the Orinoco, gets the extensive gold fields in the interior, which constituted one of the chief matters of contention.

When the president of the commission, Professor de Martens of the University of St. Petersburg, read the decision, he expressed satisfaction that the commission had been able to reach a unanimous decision, and that the former good understanding between the two governments was now to be restored. He expressed thanks to his colleagues, to the respective counsel, and especially to the French government for its generous hospitality to the tribunal. Remarks were then made by Mr. Harrison and Sir Richard Webster, the latter declaring that Great Britain and Venezuela would now work side by side in harmony. Afterwards, replying to an inquiry, he said he was satisfied with the result. Mr. Harrison, replying to a similar inquiry, said that "It might have been worse."

The award becomes binding when it is officially communicated to the two governments. Thus ends a dispute which has run on in one way or another for three-quarters of a century, which has broken up diplomatic relations, and at one time threatened war. How simple, inexpensive and honorable the settlement became the moment the nations were willing to drop sentiment, passion and unintelligent wrangling, and carry the controversy to an impartial tribunal capable of grasping and sifting all the facts! The decision, which both nations will without doubt loyally accept, commends itself to the world's sense of fairness. It gives neither party ground for exultation over the other or for feeling humiliated because

of entire defeat. It is a great triumph of reason and good sense, and must do much to strengthen public sentiment in favor of resort to arbitration even in the most difficult and delicate controversies.

The Basis of Civilization.

In his brilliant address on International Relations and Responsibilities before the International Congressional Council at Boston, on the 22d of September, Dr. Lyman Abbott took some most extraordinary grounds in support of his thesis that war is sometimes an advisable and righteous instrument for the promotion of human good. The position taken in this part of his address was essentially that which for many months he has been advocating in the *Outlook* and in addresses at various places. This position is not the old one that defensive war is justifiable. One hears little of that nowadays. It is rather that a certain kind of aggressive war is a Christian duty,—namely, to break down oppression, to promote liberty, to establish law and order, and, as Dr. Abbott now asserts, to lay the foundations of civilization and to prepare the way for successful mission work in the unevangelized portions of the globe.

It is difficult for an unsophisticated mind to see the difference in principle between this position and that taken in support of the "holy wars" of former times. The difference in aims, if there is any, does not change the principle in the least. The parties making the aggression always set themselves up as judges of the righteousness of the ends to be attained, and declare that their standard of goodness and their methods of order are the ones by which others must be forced to govern themselves. If history teaches any lesson with absolute clearness it is that *aggressive* physical force employed by one people against another to promote "holy ends" is dangerous in the extreme, and always leads in some measure to the treading down of liberty and to violations of justice and right, and in the end defeats in its measure the very purposes which it set out to attain.

It is curiously interesting to note that it is the necessity which Dr. Abbott has felt of finding some substantial ground for his defence of the armed subjugation of the Philippine inhabitants, contested as it has been by very many of the best Christians and truest patriots of the country, which has led him on step by step to this extreme position. The extreme dangerousness of the proceeding which Dr. Abbott recommends has been most forcibly illustrated by the recent Spanish War and its resultant, the war in the Philippines. The government went to war to free the Cuban people from oppression. No sooner had it accomplished this purpose, so far as it has been accomplished, than it proceeded, in spite of its solemn declaration against "forcible annexation" as "criminal aggression," to *force* Spain at the point of the

sword to turn over to its sovereignty the Philippine people, who had long been likewise struggling for freedom from oppression and for the independent direction of their own political destiny. When the Philippine inhabitants declined to submit to a sovereignty acquired only by force and the technical right of war, the same arms that were piously taken up for Cuban deliverance were turned to Philippine conquest, and the plea of "civilization" and the promotion of "Christianization" had to be resorted to, by all who did not turn back morally aghast, in order to cover up the iniquity of the job. Even God himself was foisted into the business as doorkeeper, eagerly opening the door to let us in and then shutting it upon our backs and standing against it to keep us from getting out!

But it is about the extraordinary arguments brought by Dr. Abbott to support his position that we wish especially to say a word. It is not true, as Dr. Abbott declared and reiterated, that "law is the foundation of civilization, the basis of life." Law is a part of the structure of civilization, not its basis, and the stage which civilization has reached can always be fairly judged by the nearness to right and truth attained by law. There has been a continuous struggle through the centuries to bring law up to the standard of right. Law is often among the strongest obstacles to the progress of civilization. Bad law, to which people cling with superstitious tenacity, has to be broken down, often at the expense of great suffering, sacrifice and heroic loyalty to the truth.

Civilization is founded on the lives, principles and services of *good men* and *women* who have intellectual and spiritual perception of the truth of God and the courage and endurance to promote and uphold this until it is accepted and incorporated into the structure of society. Take away men and women of love and goodwill, and civilization, guarded by no matter what structure of good law, goes backward. Even the educative value of good law departs when righteous and loving personalities depart. Roman law, to which Dr. Abbott appeals, was of absolutely no protection to Christians when bad emperors were in power, and even good Roman emperors were among the severest persecutors.

In view of these considerations, which are too evident to need elucidation, the plea that law is the basis of civilization, and that its acceptance must be forced by the sword as the primary condition of civil and religious advancement, is a monstrous perversion of the whole history of Christian civil and political progress. The position of those who hold that the employment of deadly physical force, whatever its immediate results, has crippled and impeded the redeeming and transforming power of love and truth, and who discard war with its abominations and inhumanities as incompatible with a truly human and Christian spirit, may not be convincing to one who

takes the above fallacious position as to law; but those who take it, in addition to the assurance that they are near the mind and heart of the Master, have the strongest and truest rational and historic grounds for believing that thereby they can advance the cause of civilization indefinitely more than by upholding or practising the "civilizing" brutalities of battle. They are not likely at any rate to be driven from their "trenches" by such reasoning as that which Dr. Abbott discharges at them.

We are not surprised that Mr. Cary from Japan and other missionaries in actual service deplored Dr. Abbott's utterances as "a terrible blow to foreign missions," and felt that it was a degradation to Christianity to assume that it could successfully enter the ill-civilized portions of humanity only as the tail-end of a conquering army. Dr. Abbott must have forgotten for the moment his missionary history,—the early unarmed triumphs of Christianity against the "law and order" of the world, the modern China Inland Mission, the Universities Mission to Central Africa, the Titus Coan work in Hawaii, and many other mission enterprises which have wholly discarded reliance on the sword. If the success of Christian missions has so far been "only like the light of a glowworm in pitch darkness," as Dr. Abbott claims, it has not been for the lack of armies and navies, but because the "civilized" nations have gone in after them with the sword and stabbed the life nearly out of them, or "soaked" out confidence in them by the traffic in rum.

Dr. Abbott asserts, in defence of his claim for the superior efficiency of force in making way for the evangelization of the world, that in Christian work law must precede gospel. But the law which precedes gospel is the perfect law of God, not the bungling and imperfect law of man, and in the enforcement of the claims of God's law ministers of the gospel, in our time at least, do not descend from their pulpits with a sword and proceed to stab to death a lot of their unwilling hearers in order to reduce the rest to submission. The motive which the true minister of the gospel uses, for the most part, to break men down and lead them to repentance and submission to the divine will, is the goodness and love of God, not the wrath and terrors of the law. But for the proclamation of love and mercy, which "rejoices against judgment," the law would have made no progress in the redemption of humanity. So far as it made the effort it was a conspicuous failure. The doctrine of the supreme redemptive power of love, which has at last nearly displaced from the Christian pulpit the old terrific, heartless propaganda of wrath, has had no more conspicuous advocacy than that of the Plymouth Church pulpit when Dr. Abbott stood in it. It seems a strange reversion to something like the days of Calvin and Servetus to hear Dr. Abbott before the great Council of Congregationalists virtually defending with his superb and captivating rhetoric the ap-

plication of the very theory which he has for forty years been among the foremost in helping to destroy. Only the necessities of a false position on the Philippine question could, it seems to us, have ever led him to the employment of such arguments.

London Boulevardism.

Later information shows that the breaking up of the meeting in Trafalgar Square, called to protest against war with the Transvaal, was a much more serious affair than our note on the subject last month indicated. The breaking up of the peace demonstration was brought about, the London *Daily Chronicle* says, "in obedience to the direct advice of two or three of the less reputable London newspapers," meaning the *Daily Mail*, the *Sun* and the *Evening News*. We had supposed that some of the "Yellow" journals of this country could not be outdone in lying and mischief-making, but the course of these London "reptile" papers outdid anything of the kind we have seen in this "wild and woolly" America. Think of calling such men as Hodgson Pratt, Felix Moscheles, Mr. Passmore Edwards, Mr. William Randal Cremer, Dr. G. B. Clark, M. P., and their friends, "Boer bribe takers," "Sunday idlers," "stock-dabblers," the "fringe of city life," "bar-parlor frequenters," "self-advertising quacks," and the like! If these men are the scum which these papers represented them to be, the good Lord have mercy upon the rest of humanity!

When these men, whose devotion to the good of humanity is known in many countries, arrived at Trafalgar Square on the 24th of September, and proceeded in the most civil and orderly way imaginable to try to address the meeting which they had called, they found the square in the possession of a dangerous mob of forty or fifty thousand persons. This immense mob was organized here and there in groups, and their yells and howls arose in one indistinguishable roar. The friends of peace on the platform were rushed, were pelted with rotten apples, eggs, tomatoes, walnuts, pipes, caps full of sand, coppers, rolls of paper, books, sticks, heavy door keys, and partly opened knives. Mr. Moscheles, chairman of the Standing Committee of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, was struck under the left ear by a half-opened knife, though fortunately not seriously hurt. The success of the hit was loudly laughed at by the "civilizing," Boer-hating crowd! Many knives were afterwards picked up and carried away as souvenirs of the dastardly ruffianism. Knives are not known ever to have been thrown before in Trafalgar Square, not even in times of the greatest disorder. The people on the platform were finally rescued and carried out of danger by a body of six hundred mounted police.

The worst feature of the affair was, not that the newspapers which had incited the riot boasted of the

success of the mob, which they styled "a thoroughly typical English crowd of the upper, middle and working classes," but that the riot was justified by some of the ordinarily respectable dailies, including nearly all of the Ministerial press. The *Evening Standard*, the *Times*, the *St. James Gazette*, the *Standard*, the *Western Morning News* declared that "the seething mass of people, hooting and groaning, shaking their fists, sticks and umbrellas," was a "proof that the government had the hearty support of the people," that "Londoners were becoming very impatient of the professional advocates of peace." According to the *Standard*, "The throng was a respectable and representative one; indeed, the rowdy element was conspicuously absent." The three conscienceless papers which brought on the ruffianism, the *Mail*, the *Sun* and the *Evening News*, declared that "it was a great day for the United Services," "a great and stirring Imperialistic demonstration," that "London is unanimous in its imperial patriotism."

This exhibition of coarse mob ruffianism, even though on a scale rarely surpassed anywhere, and upheld by so many journals, is not proof that England is lost to all sense of decency and right; but it is proof that the degrading and barbarizing influences of militarism and imperialism have got a much deeper and deadlier hold on Englishmen and English institutions than is generally supposed. When a great paper like the *Standard* can coolly describe a mob which is shouting "Drown 'em!" and from which arises "a growl as from a cage of wild beasts," as "a respectable and representative throng," it is not exaggerating to say that English civilization is harboring to its own hurt an exceedingly dangerous foe. It is true, as *Concord* argues, that no recognized representative of the national life has spoken such words as those uttered by newspapers on this occasion. But John Morley, Herbert Spencer, Sir William Harcourt, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Bishop of Hereford, Dr. Clifford, and others whom it mentions and does not mention, have not, with all their eloquence and common sense, been able to keep English journalism from descending in this instance to a depth of shamelessness which would be no credit to the lowest sort of French boulevard journalism.

All these right-minded men together have just now less influence in controlling and directing the national life than the single man Joseph Chamberlain. His imperialist policy has its halter around the neck of the whole nation, and even the unwilling are marching helplessly after him. The classes of men whom he represents, as Mr. Pratt says, "through a powerful section of the press, teach the nation to glory in the subjugation of weak and defenseless races," that British wealth may be increased by robbing them of their lands. We do not wonder that Mr. Pratt adds, with great sadness: "Let such corruption of men's minds go on for a few years, and it is easy to see how